Wu Wei and Mathematical Disclosure: Fractals, Cellular Automata, and the Degree of Ontological Forcing

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com www.youvan.ai

July 27, 2026

Abstract

Mathematical systems differ not only in computational complexity but also in the amount of structure imposed before discovery begins. This paper develops a distinction between mathematical disclosure and mathematical performance. Fractals often arise from extremely compressed iterative relations whose visual and geometric consequences are not semantically specified in advance. Cellular automata may also use simple rules, but they ordinarily require a preconstructed ontology consisting of cells, states, neighborhoods, update schedules, boundary conditions, and temporal succession. Their emergence therefore occurs within a deliberately installed world. The Daoist concept of wu wei, interpreted as non-forcing rather than inactivity, provides a useful epistemological vocabulary for this contrast. A low-forcing mathematical procedure establishes minimal conditions and permits structure to disclose itself. A high-scaffolding procedure constructs a formal environment and observes what that environment performs. Neither mode is intrinsically superior, but they produce different kinds of mathematical surprise. The distinction is formalized through semantic preload, ontological forcing, disclosure ratio, and generative compression. Fractals are presented as paradigmatic cases of low-preload disclosure, while cellular automata exemplify rule-governed emergence within explicit artificial worlds.

Keywords

wu wei, mathematical emergence, fractals, cellular automata, semantic preload, ontological forcing, mathematical disclosure, generative compression, iteration, epistemic non-coercion.

Google Drive: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/15Kd8bUjm7zVaKdVIwbPhqjjV68aUZQvc

A collaboration with OpenAI GPT-5.6 Thinking. CC4.0.

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4206-4253

1. Introduction

Some mathematical objects appear to have been constructed. Others appear to have been uncovered.

The distinction is not identical to the traditional contrast between invention and discovery. A formally invented procedure may disclose an unforeseen structure, while an apparently discovered object may depend heavily upon prior representational choices. The relevant question is therefore not merely whether a human supplied the rule. Every formal investigation begins with some supplied conditions. The deeper question is:

How much of the resulting world was already installed before the process began?

A cellular automaton typically begins with an explicit architecture:

$$\mathbf{A = (L, S, N, f, \tau, B)}$$

where:

L = lattice or spatial domain,
S = state set,
N = neighborhood relation,
f = local transition rule,
τ = update convention,
B = boundary condition.

Even when f is extremely simple, the system already contains a concept of position, adjacency, state, locality, time, transition, and repeated updating.

A classical escape-time fractal may begin with much less:

$$\mathbf{z_0 = 0}$$

$$\mathbf{z_{n+1} = z_n^2 + c}$$

The principal question is whether the resulting orbit remains bounded. The intricate geometry is not inserted as a collection of shapes, agents, neighborhoods, or developmental stages. It appears through the repeated application of a compact relation.

The contrast may be summarized as:

fractal = minimal relation → disclosed geometry

cellular automaton = installed world → emergent performance

This paper develops that distinction through the concept of wu wei.

2. Wu Wei as Non-Forcing

Wu wei is often translated literally as non-action, but this translation can suggest passivity or refusal to act. A more useful interpretation is non-forcing: action that does not unnecessarily resist, dominate, or overdetermine the structure of a situation.

Wu wei does not eliminate action. It eliminates coercive excess.

A concise formulation is:

wu wei = action − coercion

Applied to mathematics, this becomes:

mathematical wu wei = formal action − unnecessary ontological imposition

The investigator still chooses a seed, an operation, a representation, and a criterion of observation. The objective is not an impossible absence of assumptions. It is the minimization of assumptions whose only function is to predetermine what kind of world may appear.

A non-forcing mathematical procedure therefore has four properties:

1. The initial specification is small.
2. The initial specification contains little semantic interpretation.
3. Iteration or closure is allowed to proceed without target-directed intervention.
4. names are assigned after structures have appeared.

The methodological order is:

generate → observe → verify → interpret

rather than:

name → construct → confirm

The first order allows a structure to announce itself. The second risks building the desired answer into the formal environment.

3. Epistemic Non-Coercion

Epistemic non-coercion is the discipline of withholding interpretations that are not required by the generating process.

Suppose a finite operation produces repeated patterns, symmetries, invariant subsets, reversible transformations, or closure structures. The investigator may immediately call these objects groups, fibers, orbits, manifolds, or categories. Such naming may be mathematically correct, but premature naming can distort the discovery process by privileging familiar structures.

A non-coercive procedure instead retains anonymous formal objects until their properties have been established.

Let σ denote an initial seed and let C denote an admissible closure procedure. The generated world is:

$W(\sigma) = C^{\infty}(\sigma)$

Let I be an interpretation map assigning conventional mathematical meanings to verified structures. Epistemic non-coercion requires:

W(σ) before I(W(σ))

The world must be generated before it is interpreted.

The opposite procedure applies an intended ontology O before closure:

$\sigma \rightarrow O(\sigma) \rightarrow C^{\infty}(O(\sigma))$

This may cause the output to reflect the imposed ontology rather than the intrinsic consequences of σ.

The distinction is therefore:

discovery-first reasoning: $\sigma \rightarrow W \rightarrow I$

ontology-first reasoning: $\sigma \rightarrow I \rightarrow W$

The first preserves interpretive openness. The second narrows the possible answer space before the system has spoken.

4. Semantic Preload

Semantic preload is the amount of interpreted structure present in a formal system before its generative process begins.

Let P(M) denote the semantic preload of a mathematical system M. P(M) includes not only the number of symbols in the initial specification but also the conceptual commitments encoded by those symbols.

A short rule can possess high semantic preload.

For example, a cellular automaton may use only a few bits to specify its local transition table. Nevertheless, the rule operates within an already interpreted universe containing:

space + discrete sites + neighboring sites + local causation + time steps + synchronous or asynchronous change

Thus syntactic brevity does not imply ontological minimality.

A fractal iteration such as:

$$z_{n+1} = z_n^2 + c$$

also contains assumptions: complex arithmetic, iteration, an initial value, and a boundedness criterion. It is not assumption-free. Yet it does not explicitly install cells, agents, neighborhoods, histories, or simulated physical interactions.

Accordingly:

description length ≠ semantic preload

Two systems may have similar program lengths while differing greatly in the amount of world structure already presupposed.

Semantic preload may be represented schematically as:

$$P(M) = P_s + P_o + P_t + P_i$$

where:

P_s = spatial preload,
P_o = object preload,
P_t = temporal preload,
P_i = interpretive preload.

A low-preload system does not necessarily produce greater mathematical depth. It produces a different kind of depth: structure that appears less anticipated by the initial ontology.

5. Ontological Forcing

Ontological forcing is the degree to which a formal setup determines in advance what kinds of entities, relations, and processes may exist within the generated world.

Let Ω(M) denote the set of ontological commitments built into M. Then an informal measure of ontological forcing is:

$$F(M) \propto |\Omega(M)|$$

This expression is schematic because ontological commitments cannot always be counted uniformly. A more useful comparative relation is:

$$F(M_1) < F(M_2)$$

when M_2 requires every primitive commitment of M_1 together with additional primitive categories.

For a typical escape-time fractal:

$$\Omega(F) = \{\text{number, iteration, orbit, boundedness}\}$$

For a typical cellular automaton:

$$\Omega(CA) = \{\text{site, state, lattice, adjacency, locality, time, update, boundary}\}$$

The exact lists vary, but the comparison reveals the central point. Cellular automata ordinarily begin after a world model has already been selected. Fractals often begin before recognizable world-like interpretation appears.

Ontological forcing should not be confused with deterministic evolution. A deterministic fractal can exhibit low ontological forcing, while a stochastic simulation can exhibit high ontological forcing. The issue is not whether the future is determined. The issue is how much ontology has been installed.

Thus:

determinism concerns evolution

ontological forcing concerns prior construction

A system may be fully deterministic and yet epistemically non-coercive when its consequences greatly exceed the interpreted content of its initial specification.

6. Disclosure and Performance

The distinction between fractals and cellular automata can be sharpened by separating **disclosure** from **performance**.

A mathematical system discloses when the principal structure appears as an unforeseen consequence of a compact relation.

A mathematical system performs when it enacts behavior inside a world whose basic architecture has already been supplied.

Let D(M) denote the disclosed structure of a system M, and let P(M) denote its installed semantic preload. A qualitative disclosure ratio may be written:

$R_D(M) = D(M) / P(M)$

This ratio is not presently numerical in any canonical sense. It expresses a comparative principle:

high disclosure ratio = large unforeseen structure from small semantic preload

low disclosure ratio = output closely resembling the installed ontology

The Mandelbrot set has a high apparent disclosure ratio. Its generating rule does not describe bulbs, filaments, spirals, miniature copies, boundary complexity, or endless nested organization. These structures become visible only after the parameter plane is explored.

A cellular automaton may also have a high behavioral complexity, yet much of its mode of existence is already prescribed:

cells change state through local interaction over successive time steps

What emerges may be surprising, but it is surprising behavior of an already specified kind of world.

The contrast is therefore not:

simple versus complex

but:

disclosed structure versus enacted behavior

Fractals tend toward the first pole. Cellular automata tend toward the second.

7. Generative Compression

Generative compression measures the disparity between the size of a generating specification and the richness of its consequences.

Let K(M) denote the descriptive size of the generator and let C(M) denote the observable structural richness of the generated object. Then a schematic compression measure is:

G(M) = C(M) / K(M)

A large value of G(M) indicates that a small generator unfolds into a large field of structure.

This idea is related to algorithmic compression but differs in emphasis. The question is not merely how many bits are required to reproduce an object. The question is how much mathematical organization appears without being individually prescribed.

For the quadratic family:

$$f_c(z) = z^2 + c$$

the generator is extremely compact. Yet its parameter space contains:

- infinitely nested structure,
- self-similar motifs,
- connected and disconnected regimes,
- periodic windows,
- bifurcation organization,
- boundary phenomena of extraordinary complexity.

The rule does not separately encode these forms. It compresses them into a relation whose consequences must be unfolded.

Cellular automata can also possess high generative compression. Rule 110 and the Game of Life are canonical examples of small rules supporting complex behavior. However, their compression occurs after the installation of a more elaborate operational substrate.

Thus two forms of compression should be distinguished:

syntactic compression = small explicit rule

ontological compression = small prior world structure

A cellular automaton may exhibit strong syntactic compression while retaining substantial ontological preload.

A fractal iteration may exhibit both.

8. Why Fractals Feel Discovered

Fractals often produce a strong phenomenology of discovery. The observer feels that the structure was already present and that computation merely revealed it.

This intuition has several sources.

First, the visible geometry is highly disproportionate to the generating expression.

Second, the principal forms are not semantically anticipated by the equation.

Third, increased resolution does not merely enlarge the same image. It exposes additional organization.

Fourth, the investigator does not freely choose the geometry after selecting the rule. Once the rule and rendering criterion are fixed, the resulting structure is constrained.

The relation is therefore:

small freedom in generation → large necessity in consequence

This is a characteristic mark of mathematical discovery.

The observer may choose:

- the equation,
- the parameter domain,
- the color scheme,
- the iteration depth,
- the numerical precision.

But the observer does not choose where the principal bulbs occur, how the filaments attach, or which miniature structures recur. Those features are consequences.

The distinction between presentation and structure is essential:

coloring is imposed

geometry is disclosed

resolution is chosen

nested organization is found

viewport is selected

local structure is constrained

This combination of human framing and nonhuman necessity gives fractal exploration its Platonic character.

9. Why Cellular Automata Feel Constructed

Cellular automata often feel more artificial because their primitive ontology resembles a deliberately designed universe.

Before the first update occurs, one has already declared:

- what counts as an object,
- where objects are located,
- which objects can interact,
- what interaction means,
- how time advances,
- whether updates are simultaneous,
- what happens at the boundary.

The local rule may be simple, but the world grammar is extensive.

Let a cellular automaton be represented by:

$$\mathbf{A = (X, S, N, \phi, U, B)}$$

where:

X = set of sites,
S = allowed states,
N = neighborhood structure,
ϕ = local rule,
U = update scheme,
B = boundary convention.

The generated history is then:

$$\mathbf{H(A, x_0) = \{x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots\}}$$

with:

$x_{n+1} = U\phi(x_n)$

The system begins not with a bare relation but with a complete theory of local change.

Its emergent structures may be astonishing: gliders, oscillators, replicators, logic gates, universal computation. Yet these appear as behaviors inside a constructed medium.

The cellular automaton therefore resembles experimental cosmology conducted in an artificial universe:

design laws → initialize world → observe history

The fractal more closely resembles mathematical microscopy:

state relation → vary parameter → reveal structure

The first creates a theater of events.

The second exposes a geometry of consequences.

10. Non-Forcing Does Not Mean Absence of Choice

No mathematical investigation is free of human choice.

The selection of a seed is already an intervention. So are the choices of representation, computation, visualization, and stopping condition.

The concept of mathematical wu wei therefore cannot mean the elimination of agency. It means the disciplined reduction of unnecessary agency.

Let A_n be the set of necessary choices and A_e the set of excess choices. Then:

$\mathbf{A = A_n \cup A_e}$

A non-forcing method seeks:

minimize $|A_e|$

subject to:

the system remains observable, reproducible, and mathematically well-defined

Necessary choices establish the experiment.

Excess choices steer the experiment toward a preferred result.

Examples of necessary choices include:

- selecting a finite seed,
- defining exact iteration,
- specifying a verification criterion,
- choosing sufficient computational precision.

Examples of potentially excess choices include:

- introducing familiar structures before they arise,
- pruning branches because they appear unpromising,
- selecting only outputs that resemble known mathematics,
- modifying rules to preserve an attractive interpretation,
- naming an object before its invariants are established.

Wu wei in mathematics is therefore not rulelessness.

It is **restraint in rule addition**.

The governing principle is:

intervene only where formal intelligibility requires intervention

11. Branch Preservation

A non-forcing discovery process should preserve alternatives long enough for their consequences to become visible.

Suppose a seed σ permits several admissible continuations:

$$\sigma \rightarrow \{b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n\}$$

A target-directed search may retain only branches that resemble a desired structure. This introduces retrospective coercion:

retain b_i only if b_i resembles target T

A branch-preserving search instead records all admissible branches within the declared bounds:

$$B(\sigma) = \{b_i : b_i \text{ is generated by the admitted rules}\}$$

Interpretation occurs after generation.

This ordering matters because unfamiliar branches may contain the greatest novelty. Familiar branches are easy to recognize precisely because existing mathematics has already supplied names for them.

The most important branch may initially appear to be:

- degenerate,
- anomalous,
- aesthetically irregular,
- semantically meaningless,
- disconnected from the expected result.

Under epistemic non-coercion, anomaly is not immediately removed. It is retained as potential evidence.

Thus:

unexpected branch + verified persistence = candidate discovery

Branch preservation is the computational analogue of patience.

It allows the formal process to complete its statement before the investigator replies.

12. Fractal Wu Wei

Fractal generation is a particularly clear model of mathematical wu wei because the investigator does relatively little after selecting the relation.

Consider:

$$z_0 = 0$$

$$z_{n+1} = z_n^2 + c$$

The observer varies c and classifies the resulting orbit.

The geometry arises from a refusal to interfere with the iteration. One does not correct an orbit when it moves toward infinity. One does not redirect it toward a preferred attractor. One does not insert symmetry after the fact.

The iteration is allowed to become what the relation requires.

This suggests the following principle:

formal fidelity + repeated application = disclosure

The investigator's role is not to sculpt the final image. It is to maintain fidelity to the generator.

This is why the fractal can feel less like a simulation and more like an encounter.

The computer performs the arithmetic, but the arithmetic is not free to improvise.

The image is produced, yet not designed.

The structure is generated, yet not composed.

The result occupies an intermediate philosophical category:

constructed procedure, discovered consequence

That category may describe a large fraction of mathematics.

13. References

Barnsley, M. F. *Fractals Everywhere*. Academic Press, 1988.

Chaitin, G. J. *Algorithmic Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Devaney, R. L. *An Introduction to Chaotic Dynamical Systems*. Westview Press, 2003.

Gardner, M. "Mathematical Games: The Fantastic Combinations of John Conway's New Solitaire Game 'Life.'" *Scientific American*, 1970.

Laozi. *Daodejing*. Various translations.

Mandelbrot, B. B. *The Fractal Geometry of Nature*. W. H. Freeman, 1982.

Mitchell, M. *Complexity: A Guided Tour*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

Needham, J. *Science and Civilisation in China, Volume 2*. Cambridge University Press, 1956.

Wolfram, S. *A New Kind of Science*. Wolfram Media, 2002.

Zhuangzi. *The Complete Writings*. Various translations.